REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Claims 6-9 have been amended to depend from claim 3. No new matter has been entered and no new issues have been raised. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 3 and 6-9 will remain in the application.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Sung to the inventors, Joel S. Karp and Suleman Surti, as well as Applicant's undersigned representative during a telephonic interview on December 19, 2007. During that interview, the inventors described the invention in detail and explained how the claimed systems distinguish from the teachings of van Loef and Young. Applicant's representative further noted that, contrary to the Examiner's allegations in the Final Rejection, van Loef does not disclose the application of $LaBr_3$ to PET or TOF PET but that van Loef merely discussed the scintillation properties of $LaBr_3$. Applicant's representative further noted that the properties of $LaBr_3$ were discussed in comparison with other scintillator materials for applications other than PET and that TOF PET was not discussed by van Loef or Young.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that, based on the arguments presented, claim 3 would be allowable over the prior art of record but that she would need more time to reconsider the arguments in connection with claims 1 and 2. In view of the fact that prosecution is closed, Applicant has now cancelled claims 1 and 2 to facilitate allowance of claim 3. Dependent claims 6-9 have been amended to depend from claim 3 instead of claims 1 or 2 in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 2. Allowance of claims 3 and 6-9 is solicited.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable as obvious over van Loef (*High-Energy-Resolution Scintillator: Ce^{3+} Activated $LaBr_3$*) in view of Young (USP 6,297,506). Also, claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable as obvious over van Loef and Young further in view of Cherry (USP 6,552,348). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled in favor of claim 3, which the Examiner indicated during the December 19, 2007, telephonic interview to be allowable over

the art of record. Claims 6-9 have been amended to depend from claim 3 so that these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims 1 and 2 in a continuation application.

In view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 2 and amendment of claims 6-9 to depend from allowable claim 3, all claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of all prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The invention of amended claims 3 and 6-9 is not shown or suggested by the cited prior art. Entry of the above amendments is requested in order to place the present application in condition for allowance without introducing any new issues. Entry of the above amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Date: December 21, 2007

/Michael P. Dunnam/
Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439